

FEB 10 2000

Comment on the Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement

I agree with the following statements which I have checked:



- 1 ☐ The No Action Alternatives are not reasonable. The EIS should have a reasonable no action alternative.
- 2 ☒ The EIS is inadequate because it uses outdated 1990 census data rather than current population data for Nevada.
- 3 ☒ The analysis of transportation impacts in Nevada is insufficient for making modal, corridor and route decisions.
- 4 ☒ The floodplain analysis is insufficient for corridor and route selection.
- 5 ☒ The impact of stigma on tourism, recreation and agriculture based economies in Nevada should be analyzed.
- 6 ☒ The EIS should analyze the impacts of a crash between a military airplane and a nuclear waste rail car.
- ☐ Other _____

Comments:

The Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes the impacts of constructing and operating a repository, including transporting nuclear waste by legal weight truck, rail, or rail to heavy haul truck. DOE is required to consider all comments submitted regarding the impacts of building and operating a repository including transportation.

My comments for the record are:

7

Without more reliable, unbiased research there should not be any thought of building and operating a repository. The idea of transporting nuclear waste clear across the country to a repository that has yet to be proven acceptable is not even worth considering.

Margaret L. Dunn